

April 27, 2004

Ms. Pamela B. Katz
Chairman
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

Re: Docket No. 272 - Middletown-Norwalk 345kV Transmission Line

Dear Ms. Katz:

This letter provides the response to requests for the information listed below.

Response to CSC-02 Interrogatories dated 03/31/2004
CSC - 039 , 040 , 046 , 049 , 050 , 052 , 053 , 055 , 057

Very truly yours,

Anne B. Bartosewicz
Project Director - Transmission Business

ABB/tms
cc: Service List

CL&P/UI
Docket No. 272

Data Request CSC-02
Dated: 03/31/2004
Q- CSC-039
Page 1 of 1

Witness: Louise Mango
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

Question:

Could the timing of the clearing of vegetation be scheduled to minimize impacts on nesting birds?

Response:

Yes. The Project plans to limit vegetation removal along the overhead portion of the route to the periods between August 16 and March 31, to accommodate the primary bird nesting season (April 1 through August 15). Further, if field observations indicate that red-shouldered hawks are nesting in the vicinity of Glen Lake in Woodbridge (where CT DEP indicated that there has been hawk activity in the past), vegetation removal in this area would not be permitted between February 1 and August 15 to accommodate the hawk as well as the traditional right-of-way and woodland edge species.

CL&P/UI
Docket No. 272

Data Request CSC-02
Dated: 03/31/2004
Q- CSC-040
Page 1 of 1

Witness: Roger C. Zaklukiewicz
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

Question:

How would the use of unauthorized all-terrain vehicles be minimized along the route during and after construction?

Response:

On fee owned transmission rights of way, CL&P and UI (the "Companies") will restrict all-terrain vehicle access by the use of gates and barricades coupled with natural barriers such as non-negotiable terrain changes and dense vegetation. On non-fee owned transmission rights of way, the Companies will work with the property owners to install appropriate barricades to restrict all-terrain vehicle access to the right-of-way. The most common barricades are wood poles, concrete blocks and fences.

**CL&P/UI
Docket No. 272**

**Data Request CSC-02
Dated: 03/31/2004
Q- CSC-046
Page 1 of 1**

**Witness: Roger C. Zaklukiewicz
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:

During the removal of any existing transmission line towers, are any special lay-down areas needed? How would the existing structures be disassembled and removed?

Response:

The response to CSC-02, Q-CSC-031 provides information on the disassembly and removal of the various types of existing transmission structures. It is expected the wood pole and lattice steel structures can be dismantled and removed utilizing the existing transmission right of way. No additional lay-down areas will be required.

**CL&P/UI
Docket No. 272**

**Data Request CSC-02
Dated: 03/31/2004
Q- CSC-049
Page 1 of 1**

**Witness: Anne Bartosewicz
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:

Provide a copy of any response by the applicant to the Town of Bethany Planning and Zoning Commission letter of June 27, 2003. Would the applicant agree to set pole structure heights to the lowest height possible?

Response:

The Companies did not provide a response to the June 27, 2003 Town of Bethany Planning and Zoning Commission letter addressed to the Town of Bethany First Selectman.

The pole structure heights the Companies have proposed in the Application are the lowest height possible consistent with National Electric Safety Codes to protect the public and utility line workers; radio interference standards; and best management practices regarding EMF.

**Witness: Roger C. Zaklukiewicz
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:

Has the applicant developed a procedure to address blasting concerns, including any potential effects on resident's wells?

Response:

Consideration of blasting would be limited to those situations where the preferred rock excavation methods are not practical. This would be in specific areas, such as where rock outcrops are encountered (grade blasting) or where rock is encountered when excavating the trench (trench blasting).

All blasting will be performed by licensed blasting contractor(s), pursuant to the regulations of State and Local Fire Marshals. In addition, blasting near existing transmission and distribution lines, if required, will be performed in accordance with the Company's minimum specifications.

Blasting will be conducted to maintain safe working conditions and to avoid damage to adjacent areas and structures. The precautions that will be taken during blasting include:

1. obtaining applicable state and/or local blasting permits;
2. installing blasting mats as required near structures that could be damaged by fly-rock;
3. posting warning signals, signage, and barricades;
4. following procedures for safe storage, handling, loading, firing, and disposal of explosive materials; and,
5. reviewing blasting schedules with town officials and local property owners.

Blasting standards will meet or exceed all applicable federal, state, and local requirements covering the use of explosives. Excessive vibration would be controlled by limiting the size of each charge and by using charge delays, which stagger each charge in a series of blasts.

In areas where blasting is determined to be necessary, pre-blasting surveys will be conducted of all foundations within 250 feet and all existing potable water wells within 150 feet of the blasting site. The potable water wells will be inspected and tested for both water quality and flow before and after blasting except in congested areas, where two or three wells or structures closest to the blasting vicinity will be monitored. Additional pre-blast and post-blast surveys will be conducted at locations requested by the contractor and at the request of the affected landowner.

Blasting will be conducted by registered blasters and monitored by blasting inspectors. During blasting, the contractor will monitor ground vibrations at the nearest structure or potable water well within 250 feet of the blasting site.

If any damage complaints associated with construction activities are received, they will be investigated. In the unlikely event that blasting activities temporarily affect well water, alternative sources of water will be provided, or the owner will be otherwise compensated. If well damage is substantiated, the contractor will compensate the

owner of the well for damages or the contractor and owner of the well will arrange for a new well to be drilled at the contractor's expense. In the unlikely event that structural damage occurs at a nearby structure as a result of blasting activities, the owner will be compensated for damages or appropriate repairs will be made.

CL&P/UI
Docket No. 272

Data Request CSC-02
Dated: 03/31/2004
Q- CSC-052
Page 1 of 1

Witness: Roger C. Zaklukiewicz
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

Question:

Does the applicant agree with the Westport Department of Public Works that "any disturbance to road surfaces less than five years old will require the resurfacing of the entire road surface" as stated in the Town's letter of May 19, 2003?

Response:

Road resurfacing should be consistent with what has been required of other contractors within the roadway. The companies will work with the Westport Department of Public Works to determine the extent of road resurfacing along the transmission route on a case by case basis. In instances where the underground transmission line is being located in the middle of a two-lane road surface, resurfacing of the entire road surface may be appropriate. In instances where the underground transmission line is being located off to the edge of a four-lane road surface, resurfacing of the immediate trench area and the lane nearest the trenched area may be appropriate.

**Witness: Anne Bartosewicz
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:

Provide a response to the Town of Westport Planning and Zoning letter of September 25, 2003, in which the Town states it does not support the revised route.

Response:

Subsequent to the September 25, 2003 Town of Westport Planning and Zoning letter, the Companies presented the proposed route (with the Supported Change) for crossing the Saugatuck River at the October 27, 2003 Westport Planning and Zoning Commission Public Meeting. The Companies discussed the reasons why the river crossing route that goes south on Imperial Avenue to the Imperial Avenue parking lot with horizontal direction drilling under the river to Lincoln Street is the best place to cross the Saugatuck River. The Companies responded to questions raised about construction practices, impacts on the Saugatuck River from horizontal directional drilling, and concerns about the landfill in the vicinity of Imperial Avenue. The Companies stated that detailed engineering work would make sure that concerns about construction, river impacts and excavation in and around the landfill would be addressed.

On December 1, 2003 (revised December 2, 2003 to correct typographical errors) the Westport First Selectwoman issued a letter to the Council providing comments and recommendations from the Town of Westport regarding the Companies' Application. In this letter the First Selectwoman states that the Town of Westport does not support the "Northern" route along Kings Highway North through the local historic district (e.g. the Proposed Route in the Companies' Application). With regard to the "Southern" route (e.g. the Supported Change in the Companies Application), the Town of Westport identifies several concerns, all of which will be discussed in the Development and Management Plan(s) the Companies will file with the Council subsequent to the issuance of a Certificate by the Council.

Witness: John J. Prete
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

Question:

Provide a copy of any response made by the applicant to the City of Bridgeport, Department of City Planning, dated August 5, 2003.

Response:

Attached please find the available documented responses to the points raised in the referenced letter. Additionally, UI has been in close communication with the City of Bridgeport both prior to and since the August 5, 2003. This communication is ongoing and has taken the form of telephone conversations and field meetings, as well as the attached written responses. The following is a summary of the status of the points contained in the August 5, 2003 letter as well as related correspondence.

- "The proposed route will take these power cables under several railroad, highway and river crossings that we are interested in reviewing the specific design plans at these locations."

Status: The Companies have engaged a consultant to determine the best way to make these crossings and to assist in the crossing design. Once the preliminary designs are complete, the Companies will share them with the City and obtain the City's input.

- "The City is interested in seeing the development of a traffic management plan during all aspects of the construction together with an open line of communication for any plan changes that may occur during the work. The City also has local ordinances covering utility companies' excavations in the streets and nighttime construction prohibitions that we will work with the company to resolve."

Status: The Companies understand the City's concerns. Once the route has been established, the Companies will work with the City to develop specific plans for dealing with the above issues.

- "The City strongly supports the siting of the proposed substation in Bridgeport at the UI's first choice of sites, that being the Singer Substation site located on Main Street that is presently owned by PSEG Energy. This site is adjacent to the existing power generating plant, is appropriately industrially zoned, and would have the least number adverse impacts of any of the proposed sites on the abutting residential neighborhood. The City would not look favorably on any sites that will adversely impact the residential land uses in the abutting South End neighborhood. We would hope that the Connecticut Siting Council would act responsibly and use its authority to assist the UI in acquiring the Singer Site for the proposed Bridgeport substation thereby protecting the integrity of the residential character of the City's South End neighborhood. Even with the proposed architectural camouflage of the substation's façade, the placement of this facility in close proximity to a substantial number of historic residential structures could not help but have an adverse impact of the quality of life of City residents in the area."

Status: Since the last hearing, representatives of UI and PSEG Connecticut have met to work out an alternative site for the substation, and have met with representatives of the City. As discussed in the April 8, 2004 pre-filed testimony of Roger Zaklukiewicz, the Companies now propose that Singer Substation be located on the site identified as Site #8 in the Site Selection Study (see Volume 6 of the Application). This will accommodate the desire of the City that the substation be located east of Main Street, as well as PSEG's need to maintain its warehouse on Site #1. The City supports the selection of Site #8.

- "The proposed power line route will cross an existing high-pressure natural gas line at the intersection of Myrtle and Railroad Avenues. The City is concerned over how this crossing will be handled and is working with the UI Company on this issue."

Status: The Companies will work with the City to develop a plan to ensure all suitable precautions are taken to safely cross the natural gas line.

- "The City of Bridgeport has plans to build a new Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) along the proposed route of the 345kV line and while the line itself is not an issue for us, the placement of the underground lines in proximity to the proposed structures would be. The City's plans call for the westward relocation of the existing Water Street and the current railroad station and the City desires to work with the company regarding the location of these lines in this area so as not to have to move them again. The City's ITC architectural/engineering firm is Wallace, Floyd, Associates, Inc. of Boston, MA and they will be in contact with the UI's technical staff regarding this item in the near future to work out any design and location issues."

Status: UI met with the City's project manager on December 10, 2003. At that meeting, UI received 30% design drawings of the project. The Company will use these and subsequent drawings in the design of the Project. As the Company enters the detail design phase, it will work closely with the City's consultant and project manager to avoid conflicts with the ITC.

- "Finally, the City's Emergency Services has discussed a training issue with the UI Company on how to respond to any potential problems at manhole or substation locations. As first responders, the Police and Fire Departments will require knowledge and training regarding a safe approach to these potential problems. The City has also created an Emergency Management Response Plan that will now need to incorporate the existence of this underground high-voltage power line and substation in its plan and there will be an on-going dialogue with the company regarding these items."

Status: Once detail design is in progress and the technology and material to be used is determined, UI will work with the City to develop the appropriate training and education for the first responders and integrate this into the Emergency Management Response Plan.



Summary of Bridgeport Meeting on December 10th 2003.doc UI letter to Bpt re site 10 1-28-04.DOC

The United Illuminating Company
157 Church Street
P.O. Box 1564
New Haven, CT 06506-0901
203.499.2000

Data Request CSC-02
Dated: 03/31/2004
Q-CSC-055
Page 3 of 5



January 28, 2004

Mr. Michael P. Nidoh
City Hall Annex
999 Broad Street
Bridgeport, CT 06604

Subject: Proposed Singer Substation – Selection of Site# 10

Dear Mr. Nidoh:

As you requested, I am providing the City of Bridgeport with information regarding The United Illuminating Company's evaluation of the former Warnaco property as the site for UI's proposed Singer Substation. This Site, which was identified as Site #10 in UI's site selection study, is bounded by Atlantic Street, Lafayette St., Gregory St. and Myrtle Ave. The Site is bisected by the abandoned Warren Street. UI's current substation design could be located entirely on either side of the abandoned roadway.

The former Warnaco site was identified as a viable site in UI's Site Selection Report, dated September 2003, contained in Volume 6 of UI and Connecticut Light and Power Company's application to the Connecticut Siting Council (CSC) for a certificate of environmental compatibility and public need for the Middletown to Norwalk Project (CSC Docket No. 272), which was filed on October 9, 2003. The Site was ranked fifth in the Site Selection Study, out of a possible six buildable sites. As such, this Site is not identified in the CSC application as the Project's preferred or proposed alternate site for the substation. Please feel free to contact me at 203.499.3702 if you require any further information.

Sincerely,

George Davenport
Project Manager

Summary of Bridgeport Meeting on December 10th, 2003

Attendees: Prete, Wellman, Nidoh, Estrada, Cottrell, Giannotti, and someone from the Fire Department

Singer Substation:

City does not want it in any south side residential neighborhoods which would be anything west of Main Street

City does not want to see the Remington property broken up into pieces which may limit future uses of the site

Problems with acquiring the PSEG site - city legal department will work with Wiggin & Dana to examine options. City strongly believes UI's preferred site is the best possible site for the proposed substation.

UI's problem is we need to make the 12/20/07 in-service date - do not expect a certificate from the Siting Council until Sept or Oct of 2004. With such a late date it becomes difficult to go through the motions of obtaining land from an unwilling seller and making the in-service date.

Questions with preliminary design of Singer: Can it be set further back from the sidewalk creating a green space? Can you add arches or faux windows to the exterior walls? Will it be staffed (no) and if not is there a contact number on record for the city to reach someone? Sidewalks will be the responsibility of UI. Will need assurances that anti-graffiti measures will be taken in the care of the walls.

Even though they would like to see refinements in the preliminary designs, they want us to know they think it is a tremendous improvement over what is there today (vacant warehouse)

Other issues:

Upcoming public hearing: Mike and George will talk about the event with Karen Kaufman, Mayor's press secretary - unknown if the Mayor will attend and speak or if he would choose someone else to do so.

What is the value of this project to the City? Up to approx. \$100 million in new assets.

Will need to get an easement for the property (or the ROW?) around the bus station prior to the land being transferred to CDOT. Expect the transfer to occur in early 06.

Will need a waiver for overnight construction.

Expect UI to conduct a training session for Bridgeport police and fire on the specifics of the 345kV line and the substation - once it is built. Want to know about GIS equipment at Singer and the underground cable system, manholes, and HPFF cable.

Expect paving curb to curb - will need to work on this - specifically mentioned Railroad Ave and Barnum Ave.

Seaview Ave Corridor redevelopment - working with the McGuire Group as their consultant - Nancy Shea - are currently in the assessment phase.

Will we be notifying abutting property owners during construction?

Expect us to work with public safety on a traffic plan during construction - need to be sensitive to major ambulance routes such as Barnum.

Witness: Roger C. Zaklukiewicz
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

Question:

Has CL&P considered use of the substation adjacent to Devon Station? List the advantages and disadvantages of using the substation at Devon Station in place of the proposed East Devon Substation.

Response:

CL&P no longer owns the Devon Generating Station site. This property, along with most of the other generating facilities previously owned by CL&P, was sold as part of divestiture of generation assets. Currently, CL&P only has easement rights from NRG for its 115-kV substation and overhead transmission lines that are located on NRG property.

In comparing the sites, each site would require the acquisition of land to accommodate the proposed substation. The proposed site at East Devon Junction encompasses approximately 15 acres, of which 12 acres would be developed and occupied. The Devon Generating Station site does not have available a suitable site of similar size to accommodate the new 345 and 115-kV open-air substation. The NRG property is currently divided and bounded by railroad lines, entrance roads, city streets, the Housatonic River, the generating units and their associated fuel handling, maintenance, and operating support facilities. A more compact substation layout can be accomplished by using GIS (gas insulated switchgear) instead of open-air insulated construction. However, due to the significant increase in cost, GIS construction, it is typically used only when no location of sufficient size is available, such as the Singer Substation site.

The East Devon site is located at the junction of the north-south ROW between the proposed Beseck Switching Station and Devon Generating Station, the east-west ROW from Devon Generating Station towards Norwalk Substation, and Pequonnock Substations, and is adjacent to the new Milford Power Plant. It is centrally located among these electric facilities and offer the greatest system flexibility. In contrast, the Devon Generating Station site is located approximately one mile south of this location at the end of an overhead right-of-way, requiring all present and future electrical connections to be located within a already congested transmission right-of-way.